

REMARKS

In response to the election of species requirement, applicants elect species I, claims 1, 4 – 8, 25, and 26, with traverse.

The Examiner alleges that no claims are generic. However, applicants submit that claim 1 is generic at least to species I and II.

The Examiner further alleges that group III "is directed towards a data processing *apparatus* with a plurality of compression/expanding devices..." However, this characterization is clearly incorrect in that the group III claims are directed toward methods.

The Examiner further alleges that the species are independent or distinct because they are in different fields of search and/or different inventions as disclosed above. However, according to the Office Action, both group I and group III claims are in the same subclass (class 710, subclass 2).

In view of the foregoing issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the election of species requirement,

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 17, 2007

By:



William C. Rowland

Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620